



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/608,586      | 06/30/2000  | Shmuel Shaffer       | M-8509-US           | 9498             |

33031 7590 09/30/2004

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP  
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.  
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201  
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

ESCALANTE, OVIDIO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2645

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/608,586

Applicant(s)

SHAFFER ET AL.

Examiner

Ovidio Escalante

Art Unit

2645

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

*Advisory Action*

Applicant contends that the prior art does not teach anticipate, teach, or suggest “presenting an option to specify a quorum associated with a meet-me conference call, in response to user input to an application program co-resident with a terminal. Applicant further states that a predetermine list of potential participants is clearly not the same as specifying a quorum and forcing a caller to identify one of several named teleconferences is also clearly different from present an option to specify a quorum associated with a conference call. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As previously discussed by the Examiner in the Office Action and in the Interview held on July 27, 2004, the Examiner believes that the current claims reads on the prior art since given the broadest reasonable interpretation of “quorum” which can read as “a select group” and given that the prior art teaches of selecting a predetermined group (select group of participants) then the claimed limitations are met.

The pertinent definitions, as defined by Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary Tenth Edition of quorum is defined as 1: a select group or 2: the number (as a majority) of officers or members of a body that when duly assembled is legally competent to transact business.

The Examiner believes that given the defined definition of quorum, as long as the prior art reference reads on at least one of the defined definition then a proper rejection can be made. While the second provided definition is more detailed than the first definition the Examiner can broadly interpret the claim, as long as it is within any of the defined definition. Therefore, the Examiner is maintaining the rejection since the prior art at least teaches of a “select group” i.e. a select conference group.

Art Unit: 2645

In light of Applicant's specification, quorum appears to be defined as e.g., persons specified to have indicated availability to join the meet-me conference call or a specific number of people. As shown in the prior art, specific persons can be selected based on a list and talkers/non-talkers can also be specified. Therefore, the Examiner believes the current claims do not distinguish from the prior art of record and thus the rejection is maintained.